

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The rejection of presently pending claims 1-4, 6-7, 12-13 and 15-16 as being anticipated in view of Davis is respectfully traversed and should be withdrawn.

Davis discloses a synthesized clock microcomputer with power saving (title). The system of Davis provides a microcomputer having predetermined clock frequency requirements to receive pulses from a multiplying type frequency synthesizer. The synthesizer is responsive to program instructions and changes the frequency of oscillation when required to reduce the power dissipated by the microcomputer (abstract).

In contrast, the present invention provides a programmable device having a first circuit capable of storing programmable information and a second circuit capable of providing a plurality of output clocks each capable of oscillating at a different one of a plurality of frequencies (page 6, lines 13-16). The output clocks are generated in response to a reference clock frequency and one or more programming inputs. Davis does not claim or disclose a second circuit capable of providing a plurality of output clocks in response to a reference clock frequency and one or more programming inputs with a first circuit capable of storing programmable information. As such, Davis does not anticipate the presently claimed invention and the rejection should be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The rejection of presently pending claims 1, 10, 12 and 15 as being anticipated in view of Hotta is respectfully traversed and should be withdrawn.

Hotta discloses a data processing system generating clock signal from an input clock, phase locked to the input clock and used for clocking logic devices (title). The output clocks in Hotta (i.e., K1 and K2 in FIG. 16-22 and in FIGS. 26-27 and K41, K42, K43 and K44 in FIGS. 23-25 and 28) each describe output signals (e.g., K1 and K2) that are phase-locked with the original clock signal K (see, for example, column 5, line 18). As a result, the output signals K1 and K2 each have **the same frequency** as that of the signal K (column 11, lines 13-19). The output signals of Hotta are merely phase shifted with respect to one another. See, for example, the various timing diagram such as FIGS. 14-15, FIG. 18 and FIG. 20. At best, the output signals K1 and K2 are frequency divided (or multiplied) with respect to the input waveform but are clearly only phase shifted with respect to each other.

In contrast, the present invention provides a programmable device comprises a first circuit capable of storing programmable information and a second circuit capable of providing a plurality of output clocks, each capable of oscillating at a

different one of a plurality of frequencies (page 6, lines 13-16). Hotta does not disclose a second circuit capable of providing a plurality of output clocks each of capable of oscillating at a different one of a plurality of frequencies, in response to a reference clock frequency and one or more programming inputs. As such, Hotta does not anticipate the presently claimed invention and the rejection should be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

The rejection of claims 5, 10-11, 14 and 17-20 as being obvious over Davis in view of Hotta has been obviated by appropriate amendment and should be withdrawn.

Page 6 of the Office Action states that Davis fails to explicitly teach providing a programmable logic device comprising the elements of claim 1 as claimed. None of the citations to Davis or Hotta disclose or suggest providing a second circuit capable of providing a plurality of output clocks each capable of oscillating at a different one of a plurality of frequencies, where the output clocks are generated in response to (i) the reference clock frequency and (ii) one or more programming inputs where the second circuit is implemented in a programmable device. Each of the citations to Hotta fail to disclose or suggest providing a plurality of output clocks each capable of operating at different

one of a plurality of frequencies implemented in a programmable device. Davis fails to cure the deficiencies of Hotta since it is silent with regard to programmable devices. Neither of the references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the programmable device claimed in presently pending independent claims 1, 12 or 15. As such the rejection should be withdrawn.


Accordingly, the present application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action by the Examiner is respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully invited to call the Applicants' representative should it be deemed beneficial to further advance prosecution of the application.

If any additional fees are due, please charge our office Account No. 02-2712.

Respectfully submitted,

BLISS McGLYNN, P.C.



Christopher P. Maiorana
Registration No. P-42,829
2075 West Big Beaver Road, Suite 600
Troy, MI 48084-3443
(248) 649-6090

Dated: March 2, 1998

Docket No.: 0325.00063